

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

TPG Telecom Limited v. Dragoslav Kovacevic, Qubit10  
Case No. D2025-2970

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is TPG Telecom Limited, Australia, represented by Bird & Bird, Australia.

The Respondent is Dragoslav Kovacevic, Qubit10, Germany, represented by Benner Holding, Germany.  
See further below for a discussion as to Respondent identity.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <tpg.one> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 25, 2025. On July 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On July 25, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Disputed Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 28, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on August 7, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 7, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 27, 2025. The Respondent requested an extension to file a Response. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5(b) and (e), the Center granted the Respondent’s request and the new due date for the Response was September 17, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on September 17, 2025.

The Center appointed Nick J. Gardner as the sole panelist in this matter on September 26, 2025. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

#### **4. Factual Background**

The Complainant is an Australian company resulting from the merger, in 2020, between Vodafone Hutchison Australia Pty Limited and TPG Corporation Limited (subsequently named TPG Telecom Limited). The Complainant operates in the telecommunication field and since the merger provides 7.5 million fixed and mobile telecommunication services to customers across more than 5,700 mobile sites, and approximately 35,000 km of metropolitan, inter-capital, and subsea cable systems. For the 2024 financial year, the Complainant's group service revenue amounted to AUD 4,702 million. The Complainant is the second largest telecommunication company listed on the Australian Securities Exchange with a current market capitalization of USD 10.15 billion. The term TPG in the Complainant's name derives from an acronym for a predecessor entity that was called Total Peripherals Group.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademarks consisting in, or including the term "tpg":

- TPG (word), Australia registration No. 2145024, registered on December 23, 2020, covering goods and services in classes 9 and 38;
- TPG (figurative), Australia registration No. 2224669, registered on November 1, 2021, covering goods and services in classes 9 and 38;
- TPG TELECOM (word), Australia registration No. 2145022, December 23, 2020, covering goods and services in classes 9 and 38;
- TPG TELECOM (figurative), Australia registration No. 2145026, December 23, 2020, covering goods and services in classes 9 and 38;

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain names <tpgtelecom.com.au> and <tpg.com.au>.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on May 7, 2025. It resolves by redirection to a website located at "www.the-platform-group.com" (the "Respondent's Website"). The content on that website is available in German or English. See further below for a discussion about the Respondent identity. The Platform Group AG (TPG AG) is a publicly traded German company operating online software platforms serving multiple industries. In 2024 it had net revenues of over EUR 900 million, over 5 million customers and over 1,000 employees.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

Notably, the Complainant contends as follows.

The Disputed Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's registered TPG trademarks. The addition of the ".one" generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") does not prevent a finding of identity.

The Respondent has not been granted any rights to use the TPG trademarks. The Disputed Domain Name redirects to a third-party website with no apparent connection to the Respondent, which does not support legitimate interests.

Given the term “tpg” has a distinctive nature as a coined mark and the Complainant’s significant reputation, there is no legitimate basis for registration of the Disputed Domain Name other than to disrupt the Complainant’s business or for commercial gain as a result of confusion. This amounts to registration and use in bad faith.

The Complainant also notes that the Disputed Domain Name was registered shortly after the Complainant filed Australian trade mark application no. 2544506 for a logo mark comprising TPG on May 1, 2025. It says it is likely that, given the proximity of the trade mark application filing date to the Respondent’s acquisition of the Disputed Domain Name, and the fame of the Complainant’s mark generally, that the registration of the Domain Name was opportunistic, and in bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied all three of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent contends that:

1. The Disputed Domain Name is not similar to the TPG trademark given the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “one” – see *Bayerische Motoren Werke AG v. Masakazu/Living By Blue Co., Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [DMW2015-0001](#).
2. The Disputed Domain Name was registered for The Platform Group AG’s legitimate business expansion, where “tpg” serves as a natural abbreviation of the company’s name.
3. The Platform Group AG, as a publicly traded German company, has independent rights to use its own corporate abbreviation for business purposes.
4. The Disputed Domain Name was registered as part of a genuine business initiative to create a unified digital presence, without knowledge of or intent to target the Complainant’s trademark rights.
5. The Disputed Domain Name is being used in connection with The Platform Group AG’s legitimate e-commerce platform business, serving genuine commercial purposes.
6. The three-letter abbreviation “tpg” is inherently generic and descriptive, requiring the Complainant to meet a higher evidentiary burden. The Respondent provides multiple examples of other usages of “tpg”.
7. The Respondent has used the “tpg” abbreviation through stock ticker symbols TPG.DE and TPG.F on the Frankfurt Stock Exchange since 2023.
8. The Respondent says its customers are in a different industry and different geographic location compared to those of the Complainant.

The Respondent requests a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking. It does so on the basis that it clearly has legitimate rights and the Complainant should have identified the Respondent’s obvious legitimate business interests before filing the Complaint; there is geographic separation between the Respondent and the Complainant; there is customer separation – the Complainant operates exclusively in Australian telecommunications while the Respondent serves European software markets; and the Complaint has a weak legal basis – a three-letter generic abbreviation with multiple legitimate uses cannot support a claim against a geographically separated entity.

## 6. Discussion and Findings

### Preliminary Issue – Respondent Identity

Registrar disclosure identified the Respondent as being Dragoslav Kovacevic whose job title was CEO and whose organisation was described as Qubit10. The Response as filed describes the Respondent as “Dragoslav Kovacevic/The Platform Group AG”. The Response is drafted on the basis that The Platform Group AG is the substantive Respondent. No explanation is provided of what Mr. Kovacevic’s position is, or who “Qubit10” is. LinkedIn contains a profile of a Dragoslav Kovacevic with a job title of Enterprise Architect at The Platform Group AG.<sup>1</sup> In the circumstances the Panel infers that the Disputed Domain Name was registered by Mr. Kovacevic on behalf of The Platform Group AG and references in this decision to the Respondent include a reference to that company.

It is convenient at this point to note that following Registrar verification of the Respondent identity the Complainant filed an amended Complaint which sought in various places to draw adverse inferences based on the fact that the named Respondent (Dragoslav Kovacevic) was a different person to the entity operating the Respondent’s Website (The Platform Group AG). The Panel considers those inferences as suggested by the Complainant are entirely unwarranted. It is not unusual to come across situations where the respondent of record is an individual (either an employee or a contractor) acting on behalf of a corporate entity. It seems apparent when considering the Respondent’s Website that it was likely the Disputed Domain Name was registered by someone acting for or on behalf of The Platform Group AG. Further the Complainant went to some trouble investigating Mr. Kovacevic (for example, carrying out reverse look ups to establish for what other domain names he is the registrant<sup>2</sup>). The Panel finds it surprising that it did not identify the LinkedIn reference mentioned above (which the Panel identified by a simple Google search for “Dragoslav Kovacevic”), or if it did, that it chose not to mention it.

### Substantive Issues

To succeed, in accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical with or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

#### A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has rights in the TPG trademarks described above. The Panel finds the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the TPG word trademark. It is well established that the gTLD, in this case “.one”, does not affect the Disputed Domain Name for the purpose of determining whether it is identical or confusingly

---

<sup>1</sup>In accordance with the position noted in paragraph 4.8 of WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”) the Panel has performed limited factual research to assist it in further clarifying matters relied upon by the Complainant.

<sup>2</sup> The Complainant identified four other domain names, three of which related to Mr. Kovacevic’s surname, and the fourth of which (relating to <obdstar.us>) it said was indicative of a pattern of bad faith registration. The Panel is not minded to investigate this further. For the reasons set out in this decision the Panel considers there is nothing wrong with the registration of the Disputed Domain Name and even if Mr. Kovacevic has one other questionable registration (which the Panel offers no view on), one registration does not amount to a “pattern”.

similar. See, for example, *Rollerblade, Inc. v. Chris McCrady*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0429](#). The Panel is not convinced by the Respondent's citation of *Bayerische Motoren Werke AG v. Masakazu/Living By Blue Co., Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [DMW2015-0001](#), a case concerning the domain name <b.mw>, that the present case is one where the gTLD serves to distinguish the Disputed Domain Name from the TPG trademark.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's trademark and hence the first condition of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been fulfilled.

## **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances any of which is sufficient to demonstrate that a respondent has rights or legitimate interests in a domain name:

- (i) before any notice to the respondent of the dispute, use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) the respondent has been commonly known by the domain name, even if the respondent has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) the respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The evidence clearly establishes (i) above applies. "TPG" is an acronym for The Platform Group which is a large and well established German company. The Disputed Domain Name uses that acronym and the Disputed Domain Name resolves by redirection to the Respondent's own website.

There is nothing to suggest the Respondent would have had any knowledge of the Complainant when it registered the Disputed Domain Name. The Panel takes the view that there are some three letter trademarks where the evidence of fame and reputation is well established on a world-wide basis and it is generally straightforward to at least draw an inference that a registrant of a corresponding domain name will have had knowledge of that trademark holder. See for example *BMW AG v. Loophole*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-1156](#), concerning the domain name <bmw.org>. There may be other cases where a trademark holder can establish some fame and reputation in its trademark/acronym on a limited geographical or field of use basis but that is not sufficient to raise an inference that a domain name registration by a party in a different geographical area or field of activity lacks a legitimate interest. See for example the decision of the present Panel in the earlier case of *ETH Zürich (Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule Zürich) v. Andre Luiz Silva Rocha, Construtora Norberto Odebrecht S/A*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-0444](#), concerning the domain name <eth.com>. Commonly if the evidence establishes that a three letter acronym is registered without knowledge of a complainant, and for the inherent value of the acronym a case may fail. See in this regard *Banca Monte dei Paschi di Siena S.p.A v. Charles Kirkpatrick*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-0260](#), concerning the domain name <mps.mobi>, where the panel highlighted the significance of short-letter expressions that have meanings other than those claimed by the complainant by noting:

"The Respondent was at the time of registration, of the view that no one company could claim exclusive rights in MPS because it stood for so many things. From its own searches of the term 'MPS', the Panel finds the Respondent's view reasonable".

See also *PCO AG v. Register4Less Privacy Advocate, 3501256 Canada, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-1778](#), concerning the domain name <pco.com>. In this case, no response had been filed but the panel declined to find for the complainant. It noted that "[t]he Complainant claims to be widely known by the name 'PCO' and to have a strong reputation worldwide but it has supplied no evidence in support of this assertion".

In the present case, the Panel considers that the Complainant has established it has a significant reputation in the TPG trademark in Australia. There is however no evidence it has any reputation anywhere else. It

accordingly follows there is no reason to infer the Respondent would have had any knowledge of the Complainant or its TPG trademark when it registered the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant however says as follows: “In this regard, we submit that the Respondent's use of a domain name, identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trade marks, to redirect users to a third party website with no apparent affiliation to the Respondent does not support a claim to rights or legitimate interests: Section 2.5.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#); *Carlos Alberto Vives Restrepo v. WSJ Trade / Wilman Villegas*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-0919](#); *TPG Telecom Limited v. Luis Alberto Laichter*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-3432](#)”.

The Panel cannot see anything in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.3, which assists the Complainant. *Carlos Alberto Vives Restrepo v. WSJ Trade / Wilman Villegas*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-0919](#), concerned the domain name <cumbiahouse.com> which resolved to a pay-per-click page. The Panel cannot see it has any relevance to the present facts. *TPG Telecom Limited v. Luis Alberto Laichter*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-3432](#), was a case brought by the present Complainant which involved the domain names <tpgtelecom.app>, <tpgtelecom.biz>, <tpgtelecom.network>, and <tpgtelecom.online>. The evidence was that these domain names had been registered by the respondent following an earlier case between the same parties, which the respondent had lost, concerning the domain name <tpgtelecom.net>. The Panel again cannot see what relevance this case has to the present facts.

Accordingly, the Panel finds the Respondent has established that it has a legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name and the second condition of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has not been fulfilled.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

Under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy a non-exhaustive list of factors evidencing registration and use in bad faith comprises:

- (i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) you have registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your web site or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site or location.

The Complainant's case is put as follows: “Given the distinctive nature of the marks ‘TPG’ and ‘TPG Telecom’, and the Complainant's significant reputation and rights in the marks, there can be no legitimate basis upon which the Respondent registered the Domain Name, other than to disrupt the Complainant's business and/or for commercial gain. In this regard, ‘TPG’ is a coined mark, with no inherent meaning in relation to the telecommunications, online and network services provided by the Complainant”.

The Panel does not think this is correct. TPG is not a coined mark – “Vodafone” is an example of a coined mark – TPG is a three letter acronym. The Complainant's own use of it can be traced back to it being an acronym for Total Peripherals Group. There are any number of legitimate reasons why a third party might use that acronym. The Respondent has cross referred to “[www.acronymfinder.com](#)” which shows around 40

different uses of that acronym – about half of which are organisations whose name could be so represented – for example Transports Publics Genevois, which is the Geneva public transport authority. Given the Respondent is named The Platform Group there is a clear and very obvious reason why it had a legitimate basis for registering the Disputed Domain Name. It has placed in evidence details of a technology project it is currently working on, which is named “TPG ONE”. It is entirely appropriate for it to have registered the Disputed Domain Name for use in connection with this project. There is nothing here that suggests bad faith.

The Complainant goes on to say “To the extent that there is any affiliation between the Respondent and The Platform Group (which is unclear), an inference of use in bad faith can still be drawn because the Respondent is using the Domain Name to exploit the goodwill of the Complainant’s reputable ‘TPG’ and ‘TPG Telecom’ marks to attract consumers to The Platform Group Website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion: *Dell [Inc.] v. Abdullah Al Zubair*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1822](#). It is also difficult to conceive of any use of the Domain Name by the Respondent which will not be likely to cause confusion of some kind: *Google, Inc.[.] v. Mohammad Jabbari*, WIPO Case No. [DIR2005-0001](#)”.

Again, the Panel does not think this is correct. The Panel cannot conceive of any plausible advantage a bona fide German company offering IT platforms to European businesses could gain by creating confusion with a view to attracting customers of an Australian telecoms company. *Dell Inc. v. Abdullah Al Zubair*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1822](#), concerned the domain name <dell-event.com> and the panel concluded the respondent had adopted the name Dhaka Event & Logistics Ltd., abbreviated as DELL, on a pretextual basis. There is no evidence to support such a finding in the present case. *Google, Inc. v. Mohammad Jabbari*, WIPO Case No. [DIR2005-0001](#), concerned the domain name <google.ir> and the evidence showed the respondent had demanded that the complainant provide him with USD 1 million in AdWords credits in exchange for the transfer of the domain name at issue. It is irrelevant to the present factual situation.

The Panel does not think the fact that the Disputed Domain Name was registered shortly after the Complainant filed Australian trade mark application no. 2544506 for a logo mark comprising TPG on May 1, 2025, is anything more than coincidence. There is no evidence this application attracted any publicity in Europe and there is no reason to suppose the Respondent would have had any interest in it even had it known about it.

Taking all of the above into account the Panel finds the third element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has not been established.

#### **D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking**

Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules provides that, if after considering the submissions, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking or to harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. The mere lack of success of the complaint is not, on its own, sufficient to constitute reverse domain name hijacking. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.16.

As set out in the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.16, reasons articulated by panels for finding RDNH include:

“(i) facts which demonstrate that the complainant knew it could not succeed as to any of the required three elements – such as the complainant’s lack of relevant trademark rights, clear knowledge of respondent rights or legitimate interests, or clear knowledge of a lack of respondent bad faith (such as registration of the disputed domain name well before the complainant acquired trademark rights, (ii) facts which demonstrate that the complainant clearly ought to have known it could not succeed under any fair interpretation of facts reasonably available prior to the filing of the complaint, including relevant facts on the website at the disputed domain name or readily available public sources such as the Whois database, (iii) unreasonably ignoring established Policy precedent notably as captured in this WIPO Overview – except in limited circumstances which prima facie justify advancing an alternative legal argument, (iv) the provision of false evidence, or otherwise attempting to mislead the panel, (v) the provision of intentionally incomplete material evidence – often clarified by the respondent, (vi) the complainant’s failure to disclose that a case is a UDRP refiling, (vii)

filing the complaint after an unsuccessful attempt to acquire the disputed domain name from the respondent without a plausible legal basis, (viii) basing a complaint on only the barest of allegations without any supporting evidence”.

In the view of the Panel this is a Complaint which should never have been launched. Anyone who inspected the Respondent’s Website should have immediately realised that it was a bona fide website operated by a large and well-established German company. It was self-evident the Disputed Domain Name was an acronym for that company’s name. Given there is no evidence that the Complainant has any reputation outside Australia and there is no evidence that the Respondent’s website was targeting the Complainant it should have been apparent at that initial stage that any complaint was without merit and would inevitably fail. In all the circumstances the Panel agrees with the Respondent that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding.

## **7. Decision**

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied. The Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding.

*/Nick J. Gardner/*

**Nick J. Gardner**

Sole Panelist

Date: October 9, 2025